TABLE OF CONTENTS

Attorney Docket No. LOT920040015US1 (7321-046U) **PATENT**

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

In re Application of	:	Customer Number: 46321
William C. BARLOW	:	Confirmation Number: 7207
Application No.: 10/788,860	:	Group Art Unit: 2444
Filed: February 27, 2004	:	Examiner: Muktesh G. Gupta

For: POLICY BASED PROVISIONING OF WEB CONFERENCES

SUPPLEMENTAL APPEAL BRIEF

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This Supplemental Appeal Brief is submitted in support of the Notice of Appeal filed August 27, 2009, and in response to the Notification of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief dated November 18, 2009 and the Final Office Action dated April 27, 2009 (the "Fourth Office Action"), wherein Appellants appeal from the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-4 and 6-17.

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

This application is assigned to International Business Machines Corporation by assignment recorded on February 27, 2004, at Reel 015032, Frame 0386.

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Appellants are unaware of any related appeals and interferences.

III. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-4 and 6-17 are pending and four-times rejected in this Application. It is from the multiple rejections of claims 1-4 and 6-17 that this Appeal is taken.

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

The claims have been amended subsequent to the imposition of the Final Office Action dated April 27, 2009 (the "Fourth Office Action"). In an Amendment under 37 CFR § 1.116, the Appellants amended independent claims 1 and 8 to recited structural features to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101. The Examiner acknowledged that Applicants' Reply overcomes the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejections and entered the amendments to independent claims 1 and 8.

V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

Referring to Figure 1 and also to independent claim 1, a system for the policy based provisioning of a Web conference is disclosed (lines 1-3 of paragraph [0018] of Appellant's disclosure). One or more conferencing policies 170 can be established which describe when to provision a Customer Premises Equipment (CPE) implemented Web conference and when to provision a hosted Web conference, based upon the conferencing criteria (lines 3-7 of paragraph [0018] and lines 7-10 of paragraph [0020]). A policy manager 140 can be configured to process the conferencing policies 170, to process a request for a Web conferencing from a communicatively linked end user 110, 150, and select either a CPE implemented Web conference or a hosted Web conference (lines 5-14 of paragraph [0020]). The conferencing criteria can include considerations such as the number of participants, the location of the

participants, the level of required security, the date and time of day of the conference, and the capacity of the CPE servers at a particular time of day or date (lines 7-12 of paragraph [0018]).

Referring to Figure 2 and also to independent claim 8, a method for the policy based provisioning of a Web conference is disclosed (lines 1-3 of paragraph [0021]). In block 210, a conference request can be received (lines 3-4 of paragraph [0021]). The conference request can be initiated by an authorized end user to schedule a Web conference for a particular date and time with a particular group of participants or type of participants (lines 4-7 of paragraph [0021]). In block 220, a selection of questions representing criteria for the proposed Web conference can be posed to the requesting end user (lines 7-9 of paragraph [0021]). If in decision block 230, the end user has completed answering the posed questions, in block 240 one or more policies can be retrieved for determining a suitable platform for hosting the requested Web conference (lines 1-4 of paragraph [0022]). In block 250, the answers to the posted questions representing the criteria of the requested Web conference can be processed along with the retrieved policy or policies (lines 5-7 of paragraph [0022]). Consequently, in block 260 a platform can be selected to host the Web conference, for instance a CPE based platform or a hosted platform (lines 8-10 of paragraph [0022]). In block 270, one or more invitations can be generated for delivery to the proposed participants in the requested Web conference (lines 1-3 of paragraph [0023]). As an example, an e-mail can be generated which incorporates a hyperlink to the selected platform for the Web conference along with an identifier for the Web conference (lines 3-6 of paragraph [0023]). In this regard, in block 280 a hyperlink to the Web conference can be imbedded in the invitations and in block 290, the invitations can be forwarded to the invited participants (lines 6-9 of paragraph [0023]).

Referring to Figure 2 and also to independent claim 13, a machine readable storage device storing a computer program for Web conference provisioning is disclosed (lines 1-3 of paragraph [0021]). The computer program can include a routine set of instructions which when executed by a machine causes the machine to perform a method of Web conference provisioning. In block 210, a conference request can be received (lines 3-4 of paragraph [0021]). The conference request can be initiated by an authorized end user to schedule a Web conference for a particular date and time with a particular group of participants or type of participants (lines 4-7 of paragraph [0021]). In block 220, a selection of questions representing criteria for the proposed Web conference can be posed to the requesting end user (lines 7-9 of paragraph [0021]). If in decision block 230, the end user has completed answering the posed questions, in block 240 one or more policies can be retrieved for determining a suitable platform for hosting the requested Web conference (lines 1-4 of paragraph [0022]). In block 250, the answers to the posted questions representing the criteria of the requested Web conference can be processed along with the retrieved policy or policies (lines 5-7 of paragraph [0022]). Consequently, in block 260 a platform can be selected to host the Web conference, for instance a CPE based platform or a hosted platform (lines 8-10 of paragraph [0022]). In block 270, one or more invitations can be generated for delivery to the proposed participants in the requested Web conference (lines 1-3 of paragraph [0023]). As an example, an e-mail can be generated which incorporates a hyperlink to the selected platform for the Web conference along with an identifier for the Web conference (lines 3-6 of paragraph [0023]). In this regard, in block 280 a hyperlink to the Web conference can be imbedded in the invitations and in block 290, the invitations can be forwarded to the invited participants (lines 6-9 of paragraph [0023]).

VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

1. Claims 1-4 and 6-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for obviousness based upon U.S. Patent No. 6,564,261 to Gudjonsson et al., (hereinafter Gudjonsson) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0172145 to Nguyen (hereinafter Nguyen).

VII. ARGUMENT

THE REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-4 AND 6-17 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 FOR OBVIOUSNESS BASED UPON GUDJONSSON IN VIEW OF NGUYEN

For the convenience of the Honorable Board in addressing the rejections, claims 3-4 and 6-7 stand or fall together with independent claim 1; claim 2 stands or falls alone; claims 9-12 stand or fall together with independent claim 8; and claims 14-17 stand or fall together with independent claim 13.

On October 10, 2007, the Patent Office issued the "Examination Guidelines for Determining Obviousness Under 35 U.S.C. 103 in View of the Supreme Court Decision in KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.," 72 Fed. Reg. 57,526 (2007) (hereinafter the Examination Guidelines). Section III is entitled "Rationales To Support Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103." Within this section is the following quote from the Supreme Court: "rejections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by merely conclusory statements; instead there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness." KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 127 S. Ct. 1727, 1741 (2007) (quoting In re Kahn, 441 F.3d 977, 988 (Fed. Cir. 2006)).

Referring to the first column on page 57,529 of the Examination Guidelines for Determining Obviousness, the following is a list of rationales that may be used to support a finding of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103:

> (A) Combining prior art elements according to known methods to yield predictable results;

(B) Simple substitution of one known element for another to obtain predictable results;

(C) Use of known technique to improve similar devices (methods, or products) in the same way;

(D) Applying a known technique to a known device (method, or product) ready for improvement to yield predictable results;

(E) "Obvious to try" - choosing from a finite number of identified, predictable solutions, with a reasonable expectation of success;

(F) Known work in one field of endeavor may prompt variations of it for use in either the same field or a different one based on design incentives or other market forces if the variations would have been predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art;

(G) Some teaching, suggestion, or motivation in the prior art that would have led one of ordinary skill to modify the prior art reference or to combine prior art reference teachings to arrive at the claimed invention.

Upon reviewing the Examiner's analysis on page 5 of the Second Office Action, the Examiner appears to be employing rationale (G). However, the Examiner's analysis is not entirely clear as to what rationale the Examiner is employing. As such, Appellants request that the Examiner clearly identify the rationale, as described in the Examination Guidelines for Determining Obviousness, being employed by the Examiner in rejecting the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Referring again to rationale (G), as discussed on page 57,534 of the Examination Guidelines, the following findings of fact must be articulated by the Examiner:

(1) a finding that there was some teaching, suggestion, or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings;

(2) a finding that there was reasonable expectation of success; and

(3) whatever additional findings based on the Graham factual inquiries may be necessary, in view of the facts of the case under consideration, to explain a conclusion of obviousness.

Referring to the paragraph entitled "Office Personnel as Factfinders" on page 57,527 of the Examination guidelines, the following was stated:

> Office personnel fulfill the critical role of factfinder when resolving the *Graham* inquiries. It must be remembered that while the ultimate determination of obviousness is a legal conclusion, the underlying *Graham* inquiries are factual. When making an obviousness rejection, Office personnel must therefore ensure that the written record includes findings of fact concerning the state of the art and the teachings of the references applied. In certain circumstances, it may also be important to include explicit findings as to how a person of ordinary skill would have understood prior art teachings, or what a person of ordinary skill would have known or could have done. Factual findings made by Office personnel are the necessary underpinnings to establish obviousness.

In Graham v. John Deere Co., 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), the Supreme Court set forth the factual inquiries that are to be applied when establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103. These factual inquiries are summarized as follows:

(A) Determine the scope and content of the prior art;

(B) Ascertain the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue;

(C) Resolve the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art; and

(D) Evaluate any indicia of nonobviousness.

However, in order to make a proper comparison between the claimed invention and the prior art, the language of the claims must first be properly construed. See In re Paulsen, 30 F.3d 1475,

1479 (Fed. Cir. 1994). See also, Panduit Corp. v. Dennison Mfg. Co., 810 F.2d 1561, 1567-68 (Fed. Cir. 1987) (In making a patentability determination, analysis must begin with the question, "what is the invention claimed?" since "[c]laim interpretation, … will normally control the remainder of the decisional process.") See Gechter v. Davidson, 116 F.3d 1454, 1460 (Fed. Cir. 1997) (requiring explicit claim construction as to any terms in dispute).

Claim 1

Independent claim 1 recites, in part, "a policy manager executing in memory by a processor of a general purpose computing system, the policy manager being coupled to at least two different Web conferencing platforms over a computer communications network"

To teach this limitation, the Examiner cited col. 7, lines 35-67 and col. 8, lines 1-2 of Gudjonsson. For ease of reference, the Examiner's assertions with respect to the cited passages are reproduced below:

> *A system/network main function is to provide users with a simple and secure way of establishing arbitrary communication sessions with other users or services, running either over IP networks (having Internet Protocol address) or other networks, e.g., PSTN. It also provides operators (an operator is one who operates or manages at least one cluster) (as an example, Cluster Operator controls and manages billing policies) a comprehensive environment in which to deploy value added services (e.g., search engine services, database services, shopping services, services for sending users stock information such as stock prices, video conferencing services which enable user(s) to set up a video conference via a video conferencing server that is external to the application, etc.) to their users and to be able to charge for their use, as well as providing them a way to link their installed base of services over to IP networks. In basic terms, aspects of the system/network act as a broker(s), and can broker communication services between two or more people (or their respective clients/PCs/phones), as well as broker access to value added services, some communications based.* ***Access to the services is provided either by lightweight clients,*** *running on various operating platforms (on their respective clients/PCs/phones) or through gateways for browser based systems, such as WAP (Wireless Application Protocol)* (emphasis and italics original, bold added)

Appellant is unsure, however, the Examiner seems to be construing the "various operating platforms" of the lightweight clients to be identical to Appellant's recited "at least two

different Web conferencing platforms". Simply put, a lightweight client operating system (platform) is not a web conferencing platform as disclosed in Appellant's specification and recited in claim 1. The web conferencing must be capable of supporting the entirety of a web conference, not merely providing "access to the services" as disclosed by Gudjonnson.

On page 14, first full paragraph of paragraph c., the Examiner acknowledges that Gudjonnson fails to disclose a policy manager, wherein said policy manager comprising a set of computer program instructions that when executed by the processor process a policy set forth in a policy document and process a request for a Web conferencing...", the Examiner stating:

> *c Gudjonsson does not disclose that policy manager having a configuration for processing a policy, though Gudjonsson does disclose an operator is one who operates or manages at least one cluster,* ... (emphasis and italics original)

Appellant respectfully agrees with the Examiner's admission. Even if one assumes that the "cluster operators/managers" can "configure" the "inter-cluster service to allow remote access to a set of services", the inter-cluster service is still not a "said policy manager comprising a set of computer program instructions that when executed by the processor process a policy set forth in a policy document and process a request for a Web conferencing from a communicatively linked end user to select one of said Web conferencing platforms to host said Web conference," as recited in independent claim 1. In fact, there is no discussion in the cited passages of processing "a policy, set forth in a policy document" for "Web conference provisioning" between "at least two different Web conferencing platforms" as recited in claim 1. Therefore, the Examiner has failed to establish that Gudjonsson discloses the claimed limitation, as recited in claim, within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 103. Appellant respectfully requests that the Honorable Board reverse this rejection. .

Additionally, the claimed invention refers to the policy manager processing a request for a Web conferencing. The teachings of Gudjonsson, however, refer to a "request for Web conferencing". Instead, the Examiner refers an "invitation" on page 22 of the Fourth Office Action and states:

> The system/network handles the initial discovery of the mutual communication channel using "invitations." An invitation is basically a request from one user 7 to another to join him/her in some given type of communication. When a user 7 wishes to establish a communication with another user, he/she will invoke some function within his/her client 11, requesting the client to send an invitation of a given type to some selected user. (emphasis and italics original)

Unlike the "invitation" of Gudjonsson, the "request" recited in claim 1 is a sent by a user to the policy manager requesting the policy manager to select a Web conferencing platform to host a Web conference. Thus, the teachings of Gudjonsson do not refer to a request that is processed by the policy manager. Therefore, for the above-identified reasons, Appellant respectfully submits that the Examiner has committed reversible error by failing to properly ascertain the differences between Gudjonsson and the claimed limitations. Thus, the Examiner has committed error by ignoring certain of the claimed limitations when making the Graham findings of fact.

With regard to the secondary reference of Nguyen, on page 18 of the Fourth Office Action, the Examiner asserted the following:

> *Accordingly it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time of the invention to modify Gudjonsson's Cluster Operator using the user management functions (implementing policies), security, and authentication and charging features (billing policies) of the system/network as base for providing Web conferencing services, to that of Nguyen's from the same field networking art discloses Internet service provider Architecture which provides configuration guidelines in its implementation of providing services on one or more of an operating platform, an operating environment, and one or more services where resource manager may provide the ability to control and allocate one or more of, resources, services and systems are preferably easier to manage because of the ability to set and enforce policies that control how system resources are utilized, preferably ensuring that customers will receive the assigned service level within a shared resource environment*).

At the outset, Appellant notes that the Examiner is employing circular logic. In essence, the Examiner is asserting that it would have been obvious to use the configuration guidelines feature in Nguyen with Gudjonsson's Cluster Operator because "services and systems are preferably easier to manage because of the ability to set and enforce policies that control how system resources are utilized, preferably ensuring that customers will receive the assigned service level within a shared resource environment." Put differently, the Examiner is asserting that it would have been obvious to include B into A for the purpose of providing B.

If such circular reasoning was permissible in establishing obviousness, then few patents would ever issue. As recognized by the Federal Circuit, "virtually all [inventions] are combinations of old elements."[1] Thus, every element of a claimed invention may often be found in the prior art. If stating that it would have been obvious to include B into A for the purpose of providing B, then all combinations would be obvious. This analysis, however, does not accurately reflect obviousness jurisprudence. As stated by the Supreme Court, "rejections on obviousness grounds … must [based upon] some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness." The Examiner's circular reasoning, however, falls short of this requirement.

However, even *assuming arguendo* that it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Gudjonsson and Nguyen for the benefits described by the Examiner, the Examiner has failed to establish that the resultant combination would have rendered the claimed invention as obvious within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 103. Although the Examiner may have shown that

[1] In re Rouffet, 149 F.3d 1350, 47 USPQ2d 1453 (Fed. Cir. 1998) (quoting Environmental Designs, Ltd. v. Union Oil, 713 F.2d 693, 218 USPQ 865 (Fed. Cir. 1993)).

it would have been obvious to add the teachings of Nguyen to the teachings of Gudjonsson, the Examiner has not established it would have been obvious to modify the teachings of Gudjonsson based upon the teachings of Nguyen.

Adding, configuration guidelines feature, as taught by Nguyen, to the network of server clusters of Gudjonsson would result in the benefits associated with these teachings without any modifications to the teachings of Gudjonsson. Since these functions are independent, there is no need to modify one teaching (i.e., Gudjonsson) with the other (i.e., Nguyen) to obtain the benefits of both. Therefore, Appellants respectfully submit that even if one having ordinary skill in the art would have found combining a configuration guidelines feature of Nguyen with the teachings of Gudjonsson to be obvious, the combination of these teachings would not result in the claimed invention. Additionally, Appellants also note that the Examiner has not even explained how Gudjonsson could be modified in view of Nguyen to result in the claimed invention.

Claim 2

Regarding the claimed wherein said at least two different Web conferencing platforms comprise a platform selected from the group consisting of a customer premises equipment based platform and a hosted platform, the Examiner relied upon col. 2, lines 51-67 of Gudjonsson. However, referring to col. 2, lines 51-67 of Gudjonsson, the conferencing platforms all appear to be platforms within a specific "cluster" and therefore only customer premises equipment based and not a web hosted platform. Therefore, the Examiner has failed to establish that Gudjonsson

identically discloses the claimed invention, as recited in claim, within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 103. Appellant respectfully requests that the Honorable Board reverse this rejection.

Claim 8

Independent claim 8 recites, in part, "establishing criteria for a proposed Web conference, and applying at least one policy to said criteria to identify a platform for hosting said proposed Web conference."

To teach this limitation, the Examiner cited col. 1, lines 12-15 of Gudjonsson. For ease of reference, the Examiner's cited passages are reproduced below:

> This invention is related to a system and corresponding method of establishing communication session(s) between users as a function of their availability and/or communication device(s).

Appellant asserts that the cited passage fails to disclose "applying at least one policy" as recited in independent claim 8, as known to one of reasonable skill in the art, and discussed in Appellant's specification. More specifically, a "policy can specify a platform selection based upon Web conference criteria, [which] … can include a number of participants to the Web conference, whether the participants are internal or external to a private network of the end user, … a priority of the Web conference" (lines 2-9 of paragraph [0011] of Appellant's specification).

Claims 9 and 10

Dependent claims 9 and 10 refer to independent claim 8. Specifically, claim 9 refers to "resolving an address to said identified platform, imbedding said address in an invitation to participate in said proposed Web conference, and forwarding said invitation to selected participants in said proposed Web conference." To teach these limitations, the Examiner cited

col. 3, lines 14-27 and lines 28-36 of Gudjonsson. For ease of reference, the Examiner's cited passages are reproduced below:

> The routing service allows users to send invitations to other users to establish an arbitrary communication session (e.g., text chat session, voice chat session, web conference, etc.) over arbitrary networks. The requests are not sent directly between users. Instead, the routing service for the sending/inviting user sends the invitation to the routing service for the receiving user. The routing service for the receiving user determines, according to a logic specified by the same receiving user, how the request is handled and what services are available to handle the request. For example, the routing service for the receiving user may forward the invitation to the receiving user's client, may ignore the invitation, may forward the invitation to the receiving user's mobile phone, or may forward the invitation to the receiving user's inbox so that the user may later read the invitation.
>
> The cluster and services within it make the necessary minimum setup for the session to be established, and **thus no network addresses need to be exchanged between the users**, thus retaining the anonymity of the users. As users can be software entities as well as persons, the system allows communication sessions between users and arbitrary data services. In certain embodiments, the system does not need a central database of all users to function, but clusters can forward requests to other clusters, and thus insure the connectivity of all clusters within the system. (emphasis added)

The cited passage of Gudjonsson fails to disclose "imbedding said address in an invitation to participate in said proposed Web conference." To the contrary, the cited passage of Gudjonsson appears to teach that no imbedded "network addresses [are] exchanged between the users. Based on the teachings of the Examiner's cited passage, Appellant's position is that Gudjonsson fails to teach all the limitations of claim 9.

Moreover, dependent claim 10 refers to independent claim 8. Specifically, claim 10 refers to "re-establishing said criteria, and applying said at least one policy to said re-established criteria to identify a different platform for hosting said proposed Web conference." To teach these limitations, the Examiner cited col. 3, lines 14-27 and lines 28-36 of Gudjonsson as shown above. Appellant, however, is unclear as to the exact teaching that correspond to the claimed "re-establishing said criteria, and applying said at least one policy to said re-established criteria to identify a different platform for hosting said proposed Web conference." Based on the

teachings of the Examiner's cited passage, Appellant's position is that Gudjonsson fails to teach all the limitations of claim 10.

Claim 13

Independent claim 13 recites, in part, "establishing criteria for a proposed Web conference, and applying at least one policy to said criteria to identify a platform for hosting said proposed Web conference."

To teach this limitation, the Examiner cited col. 1, lines 12-15 of Gudjonsson. For ease of reference, the Examiner's cited passages are reproduced below:

> This invention is related to a system and corresponding method of establishing communication session(s) between users as a function of their availability and/or communication device(s).

Appellant asserts that the cited passage fails to disclose "applying at least one policy" as recited in independent claim 8, as known to one of reasonable skill in the art, and discussed in Appellant's specification. More specifically, a "policy can specify a platform selection based upon Web conference criteria, [which] … can include a number of participants to the Web conference, whether the participants are internal or external to a private network of the end user, … a priority of the Web conference" (lines 2-9 of paragraph [0011] of Appellant's specification).

Claims 14 and 15

Claims 14 and 15 refer to independent claim 13 and have similar elements as claims 9 and 10, therefore Appellant incorporates those arguments here and at least for those reasons, the Examiner's cited passages fail to teach the limitations of claims 14 and 15..

Conclusion

Based upon the foregoing, Appellants respectfully submit that the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 are not viable. Appellants, therefore, respectfully solicit the Honorable Board to reverse the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 122158, and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Date: January 19, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

/Steven M. Greenberg/

Steven M. Greenberg,
Reg. No.: 44,725
Adam C. Underwood
Reg. No. 45,169
Carey, Rodriguez, Greenberg & Paul, LLP
Tel: (561) 922-3845
Fax: (561) 244-1062
Customer Number 46321

VIII. CLAIMS APPENDIX

1. A Web conference provisioning system comprising a policy manager executing in memory by a processor of a general purpose computing system, the policy manager being coupled to at least two different Web conferencing platforms over a computer communications network, said policy manager comprising a set of computer program instructions that when executed by the processor process a policy set forth in a policy document and process a request for a Web conferencing from a communicatively linked end user to select one of said Web conferencing platforms to host said Web conference.

2. The system of claim 1, wherein said at least two different Web conferencing platforms comprise a platform selected from the group consisting of a customer premises equipment based platform and a hosted platform.

3. The system of claim 1, further comprising a firewall disposed between said end user and said policy manager.

4. The system of claim 1, further comprising a demilitarized zone firewall disposed in between said policy manager and end users coupled to said policy manager of a public Internet.

5. (Cancelled).

6. The system of claim 1, wherein said at least one policy specifies a platform selection based upon criteria selected from the group consisting of a number of participants to said Web

conference, whether said participants are internal or external to a private network of said end user, a set of features desired for use in said Web conference, a security level required for said Web conference, and a priority of said Web conference.

7. The system of claim 6, wherein said set of features comprises at least one feature selected from the group consisting of screen sharing, slideshow presentations, streaming audio, voice over IP, audio conferencing, the use of on-premise audio equipment, audio recording, joint Web browsing, chat and instant messaging and streaming video.

8. A Web conference provisioning method comprising the steps of:

establishing criteria for a proposed Web conference; and,

applying, by a policy manager executing in memory by a processor of a general purpose computing system, at least one policy to said criteria to identify a platform for hosting said proposed Web conference.

9. The method of claim 8, further comprising the steps of:

resolving an address to said identified platform;

imbedding said address in an invitation to participate in said proposed Web conference; and,

forwarding said invitation to selected participants in said proposed Web conference.

10. The method of claim 8, further comprising the steps of:

re-establishing said criteria; and,

applying said at least one policy to said re-established criteria to identify a different platform for hosting said proposed Web conference.

11. The method of claim 8, further comprising the step of performing said establishing and applying steps responsive to a request to schedule said proposed Web conference.

12. The method of claim 8, further comprising the step of performing said establishing and applying steps when activating said proposed Web conference.

13. A machine readable storage having stored thereon a computer program for Web conference provisioning, the computer program comprising a routine set of instructions which when executed by a machine causes the machine to perform the steps of:

establishing criteria for a proposed Web conference; and,

applying at least one policy to said criteria to identify a platform for hosting said proposed Web conference.

14. The machine readable storage of claim 13, further comprising the steps of:

resolving an address to said identified platform;

imbedding said address in an invitation to participate in said proposed Web conference; and,

forwarding said invitation to selected participants in said proposed Web conference.

15. The machine readable storage of claim 13, further comprising the steps of:

re-establishing said criteria; and,

applying said at least one policy to said re-established criteria to identify a different platform for hosting said proposed Web conference.

16. The machine readable storage of claim 13, further comprising the step of performing said establishing and applying steps responsive to a request to schedule said proposed Web conference.

17. The machine readable storage of claim 13, further comprising the step of performing said establishing and applying steps when activating said proposed Web conference.

IX. EVIDENCE APPENDIX

No evidence submitted pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.130, 1.131, or 1.132 of this title or of any other evidence entered by the Examiner has been relied upon by Appellants in this Appeal, and thus no evidence is attached hereto.

X. RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

Since Appellants are unaware of any related appeals and interferences, no decision rendered by a court or the Board is attached hereto.